fellow Republicans to increase the credit that was set in 1997 at $500 to move it to $1,000. Moreover, the credit was made partially refundable for the very first time.

This made low-income working families eligible to receive a tax refund, even if they had paid no income tax—though they paid the payroll tax. And, obviously, the child tax credit helped offset the regressive impact on the working—low-income working people.

Then, in 2017, Republicans went even further in improving this credit because we doubled the credit, and we increased the amount that those who pay no Federal income tax can receive a tax refund. But a key feature of the child tax credit through these 25 years has always been that it is a work incentive.

In order to benefit them, the tax filer must have at least a minimal amount of earned income, which basically means wages from employment. As you earn more, a larger share of the credit becomes refundable, partially offsetting the payroll taxes.

So, now, this is what the Democrats have in mind: They want to turn this broadly popular, this bipartisan, this pro-work tax incentive into a government assistance program akin to the old, pre-Clinton welfare program.

What Democrats propose can no longer be considered a tax credit in any traditional sense of the word. The benefit is entirely divorced from the tax system in every way except how the tax system is going to give out the benefits.

To qualify, no one in the household needs to work, needs to have income, or needs to pay any sort of Federal tax at all. Now, even more alarming, there are no job search requirements, no job skill development assistance, and no educational assistance—the foundation of the welfare reform of 1996, when the whole idea was to help people help themselves by either schooling or productive employment.

All the requirements then that apply to those receiving TANF under the 1996 welfare reforms would be gone. In other words, their proposal provides no help to getting struggling parents back on their feet or to tackle the root causes of generational poverty.

The bipartisan 1996 reform bill—everything I just said they propose is contrary to that basic Federal reform of 1996. In other words, this is a big step back to encouraging people into a lifetime in poverty. I fear the Democrats' proposal will be a poverty trap for far too many needy families.

We would be reversing the gains made since we had this bipartisan welfare reform of 1996 signed by a Democratic President. That is exactly what a recent University of Chicago analysis of the Democrats' proposal suggests will occur.

According to this study, the Democrats' child tax credit proposal would result in 1.5 million parents leaving the workforce at a time when everybody is crying that we need to get people back into the workforce if you want to keep inflation under control, if you want to keep the supply chain moving smoothly.

This analysis directly contradicts Democrats' claims that their proposal will cut poverty in half. In fact, according to the University of Chicago authors, ''deep child poverty would not fall at all.'' I will bet the Democrats are trying to sell this on the proposition that it is going to reduce child poverty, but not according to the University of Chicago scholars. In fact, it might even make things worse.

That is exactly why Democrats and Republicans came together to reform welfare in 1996, because it became self-evident that child poverty could not be solved simply through money alone.

If money alone is a solution, why are my Democratic colleagues willing to settle for only reducing child poverty by half?

Why don't they simply dedicate more of their foreign $4.2 trillion tax-and-spending spree to completely end child poverty?

Is it that they believe subsidizing individuals to buy electric vehicles, as their bill would do, is more important than eradicating child poverty?

I fully support lending a hand to families in need of support, but our policies must be focused on providing a hand up, not a handout. Providing assistance untethered from any work or job promotion requirement or education or work training requirement is not a compassionate approach to helping people. You want to help people get in the world of work because only in the world of work can you work yourself up the ladder and get out of poverty. But being on government programs is a certainty of a lifetime of poverty.

No, it is not compassionate. It is just the opposite. It sets up a generation of Americans being trapped in soul-crushing government dependencies.

I urge my colleagues to abandon their ill-conceived, ''no strings attached'' child tax credit proposal. They would get a lot of Republican support—bipartisan support—for improving the child tax credit, but not this way. Do not yank away the ladder of opportunity from struggling Americans. Take a page out of former President Clinton's playbook. Work with Republicans to find a bipartisan solution that will actually help low-income families together.

EAGLES ACT

On another point, Mr. President, I would like to talk about preventing acts of mass violence.

Yesterday, the shooter at the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School tragedy in Parkland, FL, a few years ago, pled guilty to multiple counts of first-degree murder.

There were 14 students and 3 school staff senselessly losing their lives in just a few minutes when a former student struggling with clear behavior problems and mental health issues indiscriminately opened fire.

I hope that his guilty plea brings at least some sense of closure and justice for the victims' families. While there is nothing that we can do to take back the terrible events of that day, we need to do what we can to make sure such horrific acts don't ever happen again.

That is why earlier this year, in a bipartisan approach, I, along with Senators CORTEZ MASTO, COLLINS, MANCHIN, HASSAN, RUBIO, and SCOTT of Florida, introduced what we called the EAGLES Act.

The EAGLES Act will help fund and reauthorize the U.S. Secret Service's National Threat Assessment Center. It goes by the nickname of NTAC. An identical bill was introduced in the House by Representatives DEUTCH and DIAZ-BALART.

NTAC studies targeted violence and helps proactively identify and manage threats before they result in more tragedies. The EAGLES Act also establishes a Safe School Initiative, a national program on school violence prevention that will include expanded research on school violence.

When the Secret Service reviewed school shootings, it found that all attackers exhibited concerning behaviors before engaging in the act of violence. If these signs were recognized early enough, these attacks could have been stopped.

The father of one of the Parkland victims and the president of Stand with Parkland—that is an organization—said that NTAC has been ''essential to thwarting mass shooters and targeted violence.'' He also said that ''the EAGLES Act is a critical expansion of the program that prioritizes school safety and directs key funding to prevent the next mass school shooting.''

The EAGLES Act is a commonsense bill to fund and reauthorize the Secret Service's NTAC that is supported by over 40 State attorneys general and representatives from both sides of the aisle. It is a bill that, hopefully, honors the lives and memories of the Parkland victims by ensuring that such tragedies don't happen again.

I ask and encourage all of my Senate colleagues to support the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

CONFIRMATION OF TANA LIN

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the confirmation of Tana Lin—a trailblazing civil rights lawyer and former public defender—to serve as U.S. District Court judge for the Western District of Washington in the Seattle courthouse.

Ms. Lin has led a tremendous career fighting for civil and human rights, and I am very proud to have recommended her to President Biden.

There are many reasons to be excited about Tana Lin's confirmation. One of them that is extremely important to me is she will be the first-ever public defender serving as U.S. District Court judge in Washington State, and that really matters.